

Education Civil Society Organizations Survey

Author: Daniel Pop
Editors: T.K.Vogel and Natalia Shablya

February 2007

Education Support Program (ESP)
Open Society Institute, Budapest

Foreword

OSI's Education Support Program (ESP) has provided \$1,913,374 in support of civil society organizations in Central and South Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Mongolia, Russia, and Ukraine through its RE:FINE grant program since 2004.

This *Education Civil Society Organizations Survey* was carried out to illuminate current trends, developments, and needs of the education sector in countries where OSI has a presence, and to provide recommendations for the redesign of ESP's grant-making program. The survey targeted civil society organizations that were directly or indirectly involved in ESP activities over the past five years. This involved 400 education leaders from Soros Foundations, Foundation spin-offs, education organizations and professional associations, policy centers, think tanks, and formal and informal networks.

Understanding education change within individual countries requires an understanding of commonalities and differences across countries. This survey provides a broader regional view. The CSO Survey offered an opportunity to consult education leaders on the refocusing of the education mission in OSI and to help identify a more open and inclusive approach to meet the needs of beneficiaries and partners. Through this research, ESP also sought to collect fresh insights into the main developments in secondary education reform in the region. The CSO Survey explored the existing institutional capacities and needs of civil society organizations active in the field of education. This report includes a synthesis of the main findings of the survey and the lessons shared by education leaders.

OSI's education mission is to advocate against global disparities in provision and to promote access for children who are denied their right to quality education. This involves efforts to promote justice in education in three ways: combating social exclusion, strengthening openness and accountability in education systems and reform efforts, and campaigning for open society values in education. The CSO Survey identified education for vulnerable and marginalized children to be a key emerging priority within OSI partner countries. This confirms OSI's education mission and emphasizes that the new focus is seriously underserved and neglected by governments and donors alike.

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to Daniel Pop, the author of this survey, for the expertise, insight, commitment, and selfless work he has offered this project. Special thanks are also due to all of our partners who responded to this survey.

I trust you will enjoy reading this report.

Natalia Shablya
Senior Program Manager

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the RE:FINE Committee members and especially Thomas Alexander, the Chair of the Committee, for all their efforts and support provided throughout the conception and design of this survey.

We would also like to express our gratitude to all education leaders who agreed to complete and return in due time the questionnaire, without which this survey would have been impossible.

Special thanks to HCD Research, Inc. for data entry and Gabriela Popa for her assistance in data preparation.

Thanks to Toby Vogel for editing and preparing the final report.

We offer thanks to ESP staff for professional advice. We are grateful to Hugh McLean for continuous guidance and much valuable advice and to Nora Henter for preparing the document for publication.

We would like to thank Evelina Miseliene from the Association “New Connections,” Lithuania, and Monica Clauser from the Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center, Romania, for providing photos.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summary.....	i
Recommendations.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
1. Methodology.....	1
2. Key findings.....	2
2.1. Benchmarking national education policy.....	2
2.2. Policy priorities and CSO activities.....	4
2.3. Obstacles and future action.....	8
2.4. Funding opportunities.....	9
2.5. CSO profile.....	10
2.6. Needs.....	10
3. Conclusions and recommendations.....	11
Annex 1: Questionnaire for education CSOs.....	14
Annex 2: Survey results.....	19

TABLES

Table 1: Stakeholder involvement in school-level decision-making.....	3
Table 2: Top policy priorities.....	5
Table 3: Top activities undertaken by CSOs.....	5
Table 4: Under-funded education priority areas.....	7
Table 5: Important policy issues, CSO activities, and funding limitations	7
Table 6: Areas where CSOs should make the greatest contribution.....	8
Table 7: Decrease in the availability of funds for reform areas.....	10
Table 8: Capacity areas in need of support	11

Executive summary

This survey of education civil society organizations is a cross-country qualitative inquiry designed to generate relevant information and provide insights into the main developments in secondary education policy reform in the countries of Central and South Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine. The information presented in this report is exclusively drawn from the responses provided by seventy-eight education leaders from twenty-five countries in the regions under study. The survey was carried out in the fall of 2006.

Despite significant education policy reforms carried out in the countries of the region, the survey findings suggest that there are still a series of important issues that need to be addressed by education stakeholders in order to improve the openness of education. For instance, align CSO activities and emerging policy issues; enhance the quality of the education process; ensure enhanced access of marginalized groups; improve stakeholder involvement in the policy-making process from conception to implementation and evaluation; and improve organizational capacity to deal with changes in the wider societal context.

One of the most important findings of the survey is that in virtually all countries, access to quality education is a major challenge for children with disabilities and special needs and children from economically deprived backgrounds. This seems to be partly explained by the increasing costs of quality education and the limited effectiveness and enforcement of relevant policies. This is of special concern considering the important role that the education quality plays in children's future careers and earning opportunities.

The general findings of the survey are the following:

1. *Respondents point out that education policy-making in their countries remains a rather closed process, in which relevant information is often difficult or impossible to obtain.*

Nearly half of the respondents (48.7%) believe that the general education policy-making process in their countries is not at all or only to a limited extent open, and a similar number state that information on education policy is difficult or impossible for stakeholders to obtain. This suggests that those CSOs that would like to be engaged in education policy-making face difficulties in obtaining information and thus cannot effectively participate in policy debates.

2. *Various stakeholders, such as student and parent associations as well as other CSOs, are not at all or only to a limited extent involved in education decision-making.*

The lack of an accessible decision-making process in education policy is emphasized by more than half of the respondents (63.6%), who believe that stakeholders are not at all or only to a limited extent involved in decision-making.

3. *There are significant difficulties with access to schooling for disadvantaged youth, especially children with disabilities*

More than half of the respondents (62.8%) state that children belonging to vulnerable groups have only limited access to education. An astonishing 89.7% of respondents state that schools are not equipped to accommodate children with special needs.

4. *The participation of CSOs in the conception and implementation of education policy is hampered by a range of limitations.*

The main limiting factors identified by respondents include excessive centralization and politicization of the education system, limited access to information, lack of policy coherence, the rigid nature of decision-making processes, and limited transparency and accountability. Another significant challenge is the limited organizational capacity of many CSOs. Financial constraints, which directly impact human and technological resources, as well as lack of organizational leadership and vision also limit CSOs in actively engaging in education policy changes.

5. *There seems to be a gap between the urgency of various education-related needs and the activities carried out by education CSOs.*

Even though the vast majority of respondents identify access to quality education as the most urgent education policy issue in their country, curriculum development still takes first place among the activities undertaken by their organizations.

6. *CSOs need to cope with decreasing funding from private foundations. Nevertheless, a promising development is the increasing interest of individuals and companies in contributing directly to CSOs, as well as the increase in public funding.*

Almost half of the respondents state that public funding has increased (44.9% with regards to local government and 43.6% with regards to national government funding). A similar number of respondents indicate that private businesses, especially those operating countrywide, have also increased their donations (38.5%). By contrast, private foundations are seen to have decreased their support—38.5% in the case of local foundations and 50% in the case of international foundations. A positive trend can be seen with personal donations: 29.5% of respondents state that this form of funding has increased.

Recommendations

The urgent issues identified by education leaders in the region suggest that for the coming period, the ESP grant-making program should maintain its focus on accessibility and equity in education in target countries.

The report identifies the following recommendations that are intended to help ESP's grant program in adapting its strategy for the coming years: ESP should support the openness and accessibility of education policy-making; enhance the capacities of stakeholders to effectively engage in education policy-making; and facilitate lesson learning and the sharing of best practices.

The report also suggests that ESP should consider the following approaches to enhance its grant-making program:

- Engage directly in strategic planning of larger-scale, regional projects that would ensure the quality and relevance of the supported activities.
- Coordinate the grant program's funding with opportunities provided by other like-minded donor programs as well as public initiatives—without imposing rigid co-funding requirements that might lead to applicants being driven by donor priorities.
- Seek to identify gaps in funding in order to understand the existing disincentives that prevent stakeholders from undertaking policy-relevant activities in the field of education.

Introduction

Major debates are currently underway about the best ways to improve the quality and accessibility of education in transition countries, to replace outdated curricula, upgrade the skills of teachers and school managers, and change the values and attitudes of the stakeholders. Against this background, it is becoming increasingly important to assess current achievements, emerging challenges, and ongoing policy problems.

This survey was undertaken at the request of the Education Support Program as part of a preliminary assessment of the results achieved by the Resourcing Education: Fund for Innovations and Networking (RE:FINE) program. The focus of the electronic survey was to consult CSOs working in the field of education on the main developments related to education policy reform in their countries. Their responses were collected to redesign the ESP's grant-making program as well as provide feedback for the reworking of the ESP mission. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations presented in this report are based on the seventy-eight responses provided by education leaders from countries in Central and South Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine. All findings in this study refer to general education.

The report contains three parts. The first part describes the methodology used to collect information from education leaders. The second part presents the main findings of the survey in several sections reflecting upon different aspects of education reform. The final part incorporates the main conclusions of the survey and the recommendations formulated based on the findings.

I. Methodology

An e-mail survey was carried out between 22 September and 30 October 2006. The sample included education leaders from Soros Foundations in the various countries and from spin-off non-governmental organizations as well as from policy centers, think tanks, and CSOs that have applied for RE:FINE funding or have collaborated with ESP in various ways. Education leaders were selected based on their professional affiliation and field of expertise so that they could serve as key informants about the national context of education initiatives and reform as well as the emerging education-related policy challenges in their countries.

The questionnaire contained a total of twenty questions ranging from general issues related to the national policy context in the field of education to the particular efforts by CSOs to enhance education policy-making. Since the objective of the study was to identify the particular views of respondents about emerging education issues in their countries, a relatively large number of open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire. This allowed us greater insight into the particularities of national policy contexts and facilitated mapping of different approaches used by CSOs in addressing emerging education issues.

To ensure the quality of the questionnaire, an internal review process was established. As a result, the questionnaire was revised and used in a pilot survey (10-20 September) among selected education leaders. The pilot yielded further useful insights that were also incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire. Annex 1 includes the final questionnaire used in the empirical survey.

Nearly 400 questionnaires were sent out, of which 78 were returned. The country distribution of responses is as follows: Albania (3), Armenia (2), Azerbaijan (4), Bosnia and Herzegovina (4), Bulgaria (3), Croatia (1), Czech Republic (1), Georgia (4), Hungary (2), Kazakhstan (1), the Kyrgyz Republic (3), Kosovo (4), Latvia (1), Lithuania (3), Macedonia (3), Moldova (4), Mongolia (1), Montenegro (2), Pakistan (5), Poland (2), Romania (6), Russia (2), Serbia (4), Slovakia (4), Slovenia (2), Turkey (3), and Ukraine (3). Despite repeated efforts, no answers were obtained from Belarus, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and South Africa.

Due to the wide geographical coverage of the study and the highly volatile civil society sector in different countries, the sample is by no means to be considered representative at the national or regional level. Another important limitation is the relatively low response rate, which does not allow to control for responses within the same country. Nevertheless, we believe that the professional expertise of respondents provides valuable insights into the various national contexts and efforts by CSOs to address the emerging issues related to education reform.

2. Key findings

The survey's key findings are presented here in six sections, each capturing a key aspect of general education reform in the target countries. The first section comprises education leaders' assessment of general education policy-making in their countries in terms of openness of the policy process, inclusiveness of education, and autonomy of schools. The second section inquires about policy priorities as seen by education leaders and about effective measures taken by their CSOs to contribute to education change in their countries. The third section presents the most important obstacles faced by the respondents' organizations when carrying out work on general education issues, as well as the views of respondents regarding the actions CSOs should undertake in order to make a significant contribution to the enhancement of education reform in their countries. The fourth section describes the attitudes of respondents towards changes in the financial resources available to CSOs. The fifth section discusses some features of the responding CSOs, while the last section is dedicated to the identification of CSO needs in the implementation of their programs.

2.1. Benchmarking national education policy

The central aim of this survey was to study the opinions and attitudes of education professionals in civil society with regards to general developments and trends in the field, especially those flowing from various policy initiatives and reforms implemented in the countries of the region. To that end, the questionnaire included specific items focusing on the peculiarities of national policy-making processes, the in-

clusiveness and accessibility of the general education system, the quality of education services and school infrastructure, and the management practices in schools.

One of the most alarming findings in terms of the openness of the education-policy making process is that 63.6% of respondents think that various stakeholders are not at all or only to a limited extent involved in decision-making (see Table 1). Furthermore, nearly half of the respondents believe that the general education policy-making process in their countries is not at all or only to a limited extent an open process, and that access to information on education policy is difficult or impossible. This suggests that education policy-making continues to be somewhat inaccessible to various CSOs both in terms of obtaining information and of making their voice heard.

One might expect higher stakeholder participation at the school level, where the costs of being involved are generally much lower than in the case of national policy. However, respondents indicate comparatively low levels of involvement of partner and student associations, local CSOs, religious bodies, and local authorities in decision-making at the school level.

Table 1: Stakeholder involvement in school-level decision-making

n=78	Not at all	To a small extent	Neutral	To some extent	To a large extent
Parent associations	10.3%	44.9%	12.8%	28.2%	0%
Student associations	21.8%	46.2%	11.5%	16.7%	0%
Local CSOs	19.2%	46.2%	12.8%	14.1%	0%
Religious bodies	38.5%	25.6%	11.5%	12.8%	0%
Local government	6.4%	11.5%	16.7%	35.9%	0%

With regards to the inclusiveness of public general education, 64.2% of respondents report that education is free or almost free for all children, but only half of the respondents believe that education policy reforms promote equal access to education for all children. This is in line with evidence provided by studies that underline the increasing commodification of education services. Increasing social and economic disparity (see Asad Alam et.al., *Growth, Poverty, and Inequality: Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2005) especially affects children belonging to vulnerable groups: 62.8% believe that such children have only limited access to education. Another example of increasing divisions in schools is related to learning materials: only 23% indicate that these are provided at no or low cost to all children. The scarcity of affordable learning materials tends to especially affect children from low-income households.

Another factor that respondents identify as a key challenge to be addressed by policy-makers is the capacity of schools to accommodate children with special needs. A majority of respondents (89.7%) consider schools not to be equipped to accommodate children with special needs. Furthermore, only 20.5% agree or somewhat agree that schools embrace diversity, even though 33.3% state that policies

obliging schools to respect diversity are in place, suggesting that a gap exists between policy and implementation.

Issues related to school management and autonomy are identified as another fundamental problem area of the education systems in the region. A large majority of respondents (71.8%) report that the members of school management are appointed by higher public authorities or that the latter interfere to some degree in the selection of school management. Furthermore, 67.9% of respondents state that schools are not managed democratically, and only 26.9% state that schools can freely use their budgets. Another indication of unsatisfactory school management is that 65.4% describe school-level financial management as not transparent.



All these responses seem to be in line with the view, held by 75.6% of respondents, that stakeholders are not at all or only to a limited extent involved in school governance. However, it is encouraging that schools have more freedom over textbook choice (according to 44.9% of respondents) and over decisions on hiring and firing staff (47.4%).

Overall, the responses provided by those surveyed paint a gloomy picture of the education reforms carried out so far, especially as they relate to the integration of children with special needs or from deprived economic backgrounds. This is not to overlook that many important reform steps have been taken, but these responses draw attention to the fact that additional efforts are needed to ensure that adopted policies are properly implemented.

2.2. Policy priorities and CSO activities

In order to enhance the relevance of the survey to the future design of the ESP's grant-making program, the questionnaire also asked respondents to describe their views and attitudes regarding the most urgent national policy priorities in the field of general education. The results presented in Table 2 indicate that curriculum reform is considered by 71% of respondents to be one of the top education priorities in their countries. There are two possible interpretations of this response. First, a range of important institutional reforms have already been implemented, and if major changes are unlikely, this puts the focus on other aspects of education reform. Or second, it could be that the conditions for the delivery of education services have improved and the content of educational materials has not been sufficiently revised.

Other most urgent national policy priorities in the field of general education identified by the survey include equal access (58%) and the openness of the policy process (33%). It should be noted that while respondents regard lack of openness of the policy process as one of the main weaknesses of the national education systems, they consider the content of education and equal access to schooling to be even more urgent issues.

Table 2: Top policy priorities

n=78	
Curriculum reform	71%
Equal access	58%
Openness of the policy process	33%
Teacher training	26%
School funding policy	21%
Community involvement	19%
School autonomy	14%
Transparency	14%

The questionnaire then asked respondents to identify the three most important activities undertaken by their organizations. This question was open-ended, thus leaving respondents full freedom to identify the activities they consider to be most important in the case of their organizations. As expected, a fairly large range of activities was listed by respondents (Table 3).

Table 3: Top activities undertaken by CSOs

n=78	
Awareness raising on various educational issues	44%
Teacher training activities	37%
Equal access	32%
Policy research and advocacy	27%
Support the openness of the education policy process	27%
Networking with various educational stakeholders	26%
Activities related to curriculum reform	19%
Stakeholder involvement in educational policy-making	18%
Publishing educational materials	18%
Community involvement	18%

One interesting observation concerns a certain mismatch between the policy priorities identified by the respondents and the activities undertaken by their CSOs. While 71% of respondents identify curriculum reform as a top priority, only 19% indicate that their organization is carrying out activities related to the issue. The same holds true for equal access, which is considered by 58% a major policy issue even though only 32% undertake activities seeking to enhance equal access.

Raising awareness on various education issues is the most commonly identified activity undertaken (by 44% of respondents), which is similar to the previously presented views on limited access to information on education policy issues. Even though policy issues are seen as having critical importance, only some 27% of respondents indicate that their organizations have carried out policy research and advocacy activities. While the majority of respondents report no or very limited stakeholder involvement at policy and at school level, only 18% indicate having activities to enhance stakeholder involvement.

The second most commonly undertaken activity—as identified by respondents—is to provide training to teachers (37%). This approach seems to indicate that a large number of CSOs share the view that change in education needs to be underpinned by changing the attitudes of teaching staff and by enhancing their skills and abilities to cope with the changing environment in which they perform their work.

Respondents indicate that nearly one third of the CSOs carry out work to enhance equal access to schooling, which is in line with the previously discussed finding that the overwhelming majority of schools in the countries of the region are not properly equipped to accommodate children with special needs and that equal opportunities are not universally provided. Specific activities aim to improve gender equality and access to schooling for children from rural areas. A significant share of respondents indicate special programs to enhance access to education for Roma children.



In some key areas the activities carried out by CSOs are affected by funding constraints. Table 4 shows that the main funding constraints concern policy-related activities such as advocacy campaigns and the promotion of inclusive policy-making. Funding constraints are much less severe in the case of promoting education reform and contributing to the strengthening of school management.

Table 4: Under-funded education priority areas

n=78	
Advocacy campaigns on various issues	56%
Teacher training	44%
Promotion of inclusive policy making	35%
Resources for education	33%
Activities to further education reform	28%
Curriculum development	27%
Activities strengthening school management capacities	24%
Stakeholder involvement	15%

In conclusion to this section, we note a certain discrepancy between the policy priorities identified by respondents, the activities undertaken by them, and the available funding. For instance, although 71% of respondents agree that curriculum reform is one of the most critical priorities in their country, only 19% of the CSOs covered by this survey carry out any activities related to the issue (see Table 5). This discrepancy cannot be explained simply by pointing to a funding shortfall: only 27% consider this area to be under-funded.

Table 5: Important policy issues, CSO activities, and funding limitations

n=78			
	Important policy issues	CSO activities	Area under-funded
Curriculum reform	71%	19%	27%
Equal access	58%	32%	n/a
Openness of the policy process	33%	27%	n/a
Teacher training	26%	37%	44%
School funding policy	21%	n/a	n/a
Community involvement	19%	18%	15%
School autonomy	14%	n/a	n/a
Transparency	14%	27%	n/a

A similar picture, though less pronounced, emerges with regards to equal access. Additional analysis would be needed to fully understand what interaction of the various factors has produced this situation.

2.3. Obstacles and future action

In order to understand how the external context affects the ability of CSOs to carry out their activities, the questionnaire also asked respondents to name the main obstacles their organizations face when seeking to contribute to education change in their countries. As expected, funding difficulties at the organizational level are among the top impeding factors (37%). Resistance to change, including lack of cooperation and support on the part of government agencies, also rank high (by 32% of respondents).

An important finding is that the unsatisfactory governance of the education sector is seen as the most important cause for the programmatic limitations to the work of CSOs. This includes excessive centralization and politicization of the education system (38%), limited access to information (33%), lack of policy coherence (28%), the rigid nature of decision-making processes (19%), and limited transparency and accountability (12%). Respondents draw attention to the fact that the quality of governance in the field of education policy is increasingly at the center of public attention.

In addition to their current activities and existing obstacles, respondents were also asked to name the main areas where the contribution of CSOs to educational change should be enhanced (see Table 6). In terms of instruments, 51% of the respondents point to the importance of advocacy campaigns on various education issues, 32% mention direct contributions to policy-making, and 27% think that raising awareness on education issues would be needed the most.

Table 6: Areas where CSOs should make the greatest contribution

	n=78
Carry out advocacy campaigns on various education issues	51%
Curriculum reform	42%
Equal access	37%
Training activities for teachers	35%
Contribute to policy-making	32%
Support the involvement of different stakeholders	28%
Raising awareness on education issues	27%
Democratization of education system	15%

Respondents consider that CSOs should undertake activities directly related to policy, such as curriculum reform (42%) and those related to improving equal access to quality education (37%). These results are in line with the responses related to the most important policy priorities in the countries of the region. Once again, although a large share of respondents (63.6%) think that stakeholders are not at all or only to a limited extent involved in various policy initiatives, only a surprising 28% of the

respondents mention that supporting the involvement of various stakeholders would be most important.

CSO activities also appear to be paying insufficient attention to the limited access to education for children belonging to vulnerable groups and children with special needs. Although the survey does not provide details of the activities undertaken by CSOs, the fact that only 32% appear to be addressing this problem at all while 37% believe that CSOs should do so raises the question whether the problem is being given sufficient attention. Further investigation is needed to evaluate the extent to which current initiatives are meeting the challenge.

2.4. Funding opportunities

As already mentioned in the previous section, the lack of adequate funding is seen as a key factor impeding CSO activities. The responses to specific questions, however, indicate that overall public funding (local, national, and international) has in fact increased. Almost half of the respondents (44.9%) consider local government funding to have increased (as opposed to 21.8% who believe it has decreased), 43.6% think that national government funding has increased (with 30.8% reporting a decrease), and 32.1% see bilateral funding as having increased (19.2% reported a decrease). Private companies, especially firms with nationwide interests, have significantly increased their donations as reported by 38.5% of respondents. In contrast, private donors (that is, foundations) are seen to have decreased their support: 38.5% mention this in the case of local foundations and 50% in the case of international foundations. A positive trend can be seen with personal donations: 29.5% of respondents state that this form of funding has increased.

Based on these responses, it appears that the funding situation for education CSOs has undergone significant change over the last three years, especially with regards to funding sources. Support from the public and private sectors has increased while support from domestic and international private donors has decreased.



In terms of changes in the availability of funding for specific education-related activities, the picture is not as clear as one might expect. Table 7 shows a divided response to most items, which might indicate that CSOs have varying success in adapting to the restructuring of their funding. In addition, a significant number of respondents chose not to answer this question.

Table 7: Decrease in the availability of funds for reform areas

	n=78
Promoting inclusive policy-making	46.2%
Carrying out activities supporting quality education	46.2%
Facilitating open and democratic governance	46.2%
Ensuring social inclusion in schools	38.5%
Undertaking activities focused on reducing corruption in the education system	38.5%
Promoting access to general education	24.3%

Overall, the replies indicate a gap between what education leaders see as the most pressing policy issues in the field of general education and the availability of various resources.

2.5. CSO profile

Most of the surveyed organizations are non-governmental organizations (52), think tanks and policy centers (16), public institutions (5), and professional organizations (5). Around 23% of the organizations are less than five years old, while nearly 50% have been operating for about five to ten years.

In terms of overall budgets for fiscal year 2005, around one third of surveyed organizations had annual budgets below USD 100,000 (31.4%), one third between USD 100,000 and 300,000 (31%), and one third over USD 300,000 (37%). Despite relatively high annual turnover, half of these organizations (52.4%) have average grants of up to USD 45,000, which is an indication of the scale of the implemented projects. There is no consistent correlation between budget size and years of operation. It appears that budget size mostly correlates with leadership capacities.

In terms of staffing, almost half of these organizations have five full-time employees or less (43.3%), 29.9% have between six and nine and 26.9% have more than nine full-time staff. Most respondents (82.7%) report having up to five part-time employees, 68% have more than six external consultants, and 47.7% have up to nine volunteers. The fact that the number of consultants tends to exceed the number of full-time staff points to another possible institution weakness, which is that many valuable experts choose to retain other full-time employment and get involved in CSO activities only on a project basis.

2.6. Needs

The survey also asked respondents to indicate in which areas additional support to their organizations is critical. Table 8 shows that the main organizational needs are in the development of professional capacity, fundraising, and policy skills.

The most important set of limitations relates to the professional capacity of these organizations, which is to some extent linked to increasing competition for highly skilled labor. The strengthening of the private sector and improved earning opportunities in the public sector, compounded by the inherent uncertainties of the civic sector, reduces its attractiveness for many professionals.

Some institution-level skills are also in undersupply. One third of the respondents (32%) indicate underdeveloped fundraising skills as one of the main organizational limitations. This is becoming more acute as the funding environment has shifted towards public funding, which in turn—for instance in the case of European Union funds—has become much more complex both in terms of technical capacity as well as the scale of projects. Not surprisingly, abilities related to involvement in policy-making, such as policy writing skills, policy analysis, policy implementation, advocacy and research skills, are also important areas in which CSOs need support.

Table. 8: Capacity areas in need of support

n=78	
Professional capacity development	46%
Fundraising skills development	32%
Policy skills development	28%
Advocacy skills developments	27%
Networking	24%
Monitoring and evaluation	21%
Research skills development	13%
Communication skills development	10%
Expertise in specific areas	10%

Among the survey’s key findings is that the main factor limiting the ability of CSOs to engage in policy-making is organizational weakness. In consequence, the main needs identified by respondents relate to professional capacity followed by fundraising and policy skills.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

The main purpose of the survey was to provide insights into general developments and trends within various education policy reform processes underway in the countries of Central and South Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine. The survey results indicate that while reform objectives and strategies vary across the transition countries, there are a series of similarities in terms of priorities and current activities undertaken. These similarities are all, to various degrees, related to:

- the degree of overall openness of the education policy process;
- the extent of equal access to quality education;
- the extent of school autonomy regarding curricula and budgets;
- the involvement of various stakeholders both in the national policy process and in school management; and
- the general environment in which CSOs operate.

One of the most important findings of the survey is that in virtually all countries, access to quality education is a major challenge for children with disabilities and special needs and children from economically deprived backgrounds. This seems to be partly explained by the increasing costs of quality education and the limited effectiveness and enforcement of relevant policies. This is of special concern considering the important role that the education quality plays in children's future careers and earning opportunities.

The findings of the survey also indicate that various stakeholders, such as student and parent associations and other CSOs, are not at all or only to a limited extent involved in education decision-making. There are several interpretations for this finding, but the most important one for ESP's grant-making program concerns the limited capacities of stakeholders to engage in policy activities in an effective manner.

Besides organizational limitations, CSOs also need to cope with important changes that are taking place in their wider societal context. Respondents draw attention, for instance, to the decreasing funding by private foundations both in relative and in absolute terms. Nevertheless, a promising development is the increasing capacity of local communities (that is, individual citizens and companies) to contribute directly to the operating costs of organizations, as well as the increasing importance of public funding. These are important funding changes affecting the way these organizations carry out their work.

Based on the general findings reported in the preceding sections, a series of recommendations have been developed in order to support the strategy formulation of ESP's grant-making program for the coming years. The most urgent issues identified by education leaders in the region suggest that for the coming period, the grant program should maintain its focus on accessibility and equity of education in target countries. The following recommendations are intended to help the grant-making program in adapting its strategy for the coming years, as a sort of template on which actual priorities could be based:

1. Support the openness and accessibility of education policy-making:

- More attention needs to be focused on the accessibility of information related to education policy-making. It is of critical importance for many stakeholders to have significant input into the policy debate.
- Considering the increasing sophistication of education decision-making, efforts should be focused on building the capacities of CSOs to participate effectively in the policy-making process.
- The quality of stakeholder involvement in policy-making needs to be taken seriously in order to increase successful interventions.

- Attention should also be given to cost-effectiveness of the various activities to be undertaken by stakeholders.
2. *Enhance the capacities of stakeholders to effectively engage in education policy-making:*
- ESP should seek to support initiatives that directly contribute to the development of CSOs' professional capacity, especially those institutional capacities that are essential for their timely and effective engagement in policy-making.
 - Steps should be taken to identify appropriate measures to further develop the policy analysis and writing skills of CSOs through training and knowledge-sharing.
 - ESP should also focus on identifying and supporting relevant cross-country efforts that seek to enhance critical institutional capacities of stakeholders that are currently lacking or limited.
 - Stakeholders should be trained to find ways of building on the experience of relevant initiatives to apply know-how effectively in their work.
3. *Facilitate lesson learning and the sharing of best practices:*
- Stakeholders should be encouraged to develop an understanding of the various societal factors that stand behind particular education-related challenges that are sought to be addressed.
 - Lessons should be drawn from the effectiveness of various interventions to improve project performance in other contexts.
 - An outcome-oriented evaluation methodology should be developed using a joint set of indicators in order to ensure cross-comparability between projects.
 - The international dissemination of successful and unsuccessful approaches should be supported to enhance the sharing of experiences in the field.
4. *Consider the following approaches to enhance ESP's grant-making program:*
- Engage directly in strategic planning of larger-scale, regional projects that would ensure the quality and relevance of the supported activities.
 - Coordinate the grant program's funding with opportunities provided by other like-minded donor programs as well as public initiatives—without imposing rigid co-funding requirements that might lead to applicants being driven by donor priorities.
 - Seek to identify gaps in funding in order to understand the existing disincentives that prevent stakeholders from undertaking policy-relevant activities in the field of education.

Annex I: Questionnaire for education CSOs

The questionnaire has been developed to collect the opinions and attitudes of professionals working in the field of educational issues in Central and South Eastern Europe, FSU, Mongolia, Turkey, Pakistan, and Sub-Saharan countries. The Education Support Program (ESP) of the Open Society Institute recognizes the important role that civil society organizations play in promoting open society values in general education and the extent of expertise that is concentrated within the wide range of civil society organizations working in these countries and regions.

We want to assure you that the responses provided will remain strictly confidential and only the study team will have access to completed surveys. Furthermore, all survey data will be reported exclusively in the aggregate. Study reports and other publications will not identify individuals. It is our intent to publish the findings of the survey in a special report by December 2006.

We would like to thank you for your time and kindness to complete this pilot survey. We kindly ask you to send back the filled in questionnaire by Wednesday, October 4, 2006 to Camelia Craciun ccraciun@cenpo.ro. Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please direct them to her as well. As a gesture of our appreciation for your help we will send a set of education publications to randomly selected respondents.

1. Based on your experience how would you assess the following statements relating to general education in your country?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
	5	4	3	2	1	
a. Overall, education policy-making is an open process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Information on education policy is readily available to all.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Stakeholders are actively involved in decision-making.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Policy guarantees the respect for diversity in schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. General education is free to all children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. All children have equal access to general education.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Vulnerable groups have equal access to education.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Respect for diversity is embraced in schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Schools are equipped to accommodate children with special needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Learning materials are provided at no cost to children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Education policy reforms promote equal chances for all children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Schools are managed democratically.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. School leadership is elected locally without interference.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Stakeholders are effectively involved in school governance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Financial management at the school level is transparent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Schools can choose textbooks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q. Schools are responsible for their own budget planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
r. Schools are entitled to hire and fire staff.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. What activities does your organization currently undertake to improve the openness of education policy in your country? (Please list your top three priorities.)

1.

2.

3.

3. What do you consider should be the most important education policy priorities in your country? (Please, list the three most important ones)

1.

2.

3.

4. What obstacles do you face in your work when dealing with general education policy issues? (Please list the top three challenges.)

1.

2.

3.

5. In which areas should civil society organizations make the greatest contribution to educational change in your country? (Please list the top three areas.)

1.

2.

3.

6. What do you think are the most important factors in relation to education that affect a child's chance in life? (Please list the top three factors.)

1.
2.
3.

7. How urgently should the following social inclusion issues be addressed in your country?

	Very urgently 5	Somewhat urgently 4	Neutral 3	Not that urgent 2	Not urgent at all 1	Don't know
a. The enhancement of access to general education.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The increase of enrolment rates of vulnerable groups.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Support diversity in schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Improvement of quality services for children with special needs in schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other (please identify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Does your organization currently undertake any activities to improve equal access to quality general education in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If yes, please identify:

9. To what extent are the following groups involved in the decision-making process at the school level? (5 = to a large extent, 1 = not at all)

	To a large extent 5	To some extent 4	Neutral 3	To a little extent 2	Not at all 1	Don't know 0
a. Parent associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Student associations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Local civil society organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Religious bodies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Local government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other (please, specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. What are the school governance issues (if any) that you focus on? (Please list the three most important ones.)

1.
2.
3.

11. Over the last three years, do you think that the funding opportunities for civil society organizations working on general education issues have increased or decreased? (Please tick the box that applies for each statement.)

	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	Somewhat decreased	Significantly decreased	Don't know	No answer
Domestic corporate/business	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
International corporate/business	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funding from local government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funding from national government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funding through bilateral agreements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local trust/foundations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
International trusts/foundations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual donations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Currently, in which of the following areas do you think it is easy or difficult to raise funds for your organization's activities related to school reform? (Please tick the box that applies for each statement):

	Significantly easier	Somewhat easier	Somewhat difficult	Significantly difficult	Don't know	No answer
Promoting inclusive policy-making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ensuring social inclusion in schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carrying out activities supporting quality education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilitating open and democratic governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Promoting access to general education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Undertaking activities focused on reducing corruption in the education system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. What priority areas, in regards to general education in your country, do you consider to be underfunded by donors? (Please list the three most important ones.)

1.
2.
3.

14. What is the average grant size for the various individual projects currently carried out by your organization?

Please, specify amount in USD:

15. What type of organization do you work for? (Please tick the relevant option)

- Think tank Policy center NGO
 Foundations
 Public Institution Professional organization Other
(please, specify) _____

16. Which year was your organization set up?

Year:

17. What is the number of employees at your organization?

- _____ Full time
_____ Part-time
_____ Contract basis
_____ Volunteers

18. What was your organization's annual budget for the following fiscal years?

	2003	2004	2005
Please, specify amount:	USD	USD	USD

19. In what country is your organization based?

_____ Country

20. What do you consider to be the top three essential capacity areas your organization needs support for in order to be involved in general education reform? (Please, list the three most important ones)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

End of the Questionnaire
Please check that you have answered all the questions
Thank you very much for your help!

Annex 2: Survey results

Q1. *Based on your experience how would you assess the following statements relating to general education in your country?*

Overall, education policy-making is an open process (EDPMOP)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	13	16.7	16.7
Somewhat disagree	25	32.1	48.7
Neutral	9	11.5	60.3
Somewhat agree	24	30.8	91.0
Strongly agree	7	9.0	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Information on education policy is readily available to all (IEDPMA)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	11	14.1	14.1
Somewhat disagree	26	33.3	47.4
Neutral	11	14.1	61.5
Somewhat agree	22	28.2	89.7
Strongly agree	8	10.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Stakeholders are actively involved in decision-making (STAIDM)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	15	19.2	19.5
Somewhat disagree	34	43.6	63.6
Neutral	14	17.9	81.8
Somewhat agree	11	14.1	96.1
Strongly agree	2	2.6	98.7
89	1	1.3	100.0
Total	77	98.7	

Policy guarantees the respect for diversity in schools (PGRDSH)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	15	19.2	19.2
Somewhat disagree	22	28.2	47.4
Neutral	15	19.2	66.7
Somewhat agree	21	26.9	93.6
Strongly agree	5	6.4	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

General education is free to all children (GEDFCH)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	5	6.4	6.4
Somewhat disagree	15	19.2	25.6
Neutral	8	10.3	35.9
Somewhat agree	25	32.1	67.9
Strongly agree	25	32.1	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

All children have equal access to general education (CHEAED)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	12	15.4	15.4
Somewhat disagree	20	25.6	41.0
Neutral	7	9.0	50.0
Somewhat agree	27	34.6	84.6
Strongly agree	11	14.1	98.7
89	1	1.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Vulnerable groups have equal access to education (VGEASH)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	20	25.6	25.6
Somewhat disagree	29	37.2	62.8
Neutral	9	11.5	74.4
Somewhat agree	18	23.1	97.4
Strongly agree	2	2.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Respect for diversity is embraced in schools (RDVESH)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	15	19.2	19.2
Somewhat disagree	25	32.1	51.3
Neutral	21	26.9	78.2
Somewhat agree	13	16.7	94.9
Strongly agree	3	3.8	98.7
89	1	1.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Schools are equipped to accommodate children with special needs (SHCHSN)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	50	64.1	64.1
Somewhat disagree	20	25.6	89.7
Neutral	6	7.7	97.4
Somewhat agree	2	2.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Learning materials are provided at no cost to children (L MPCCH)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	28	35.9	35.9
Somewhat disagree	25	32.1	67.9
Neutral	7	9.0	76.9
Somewhat agree	16	20.5	97.4
Strongly agree	2	2.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Education policy reforms promote equal chances for all children (EDPECH)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	3	3.8	3.8
Somewhat disagree	19	24.4	28.2
Neutral	24	30.8	59.0
Somewhat agree	21	26.9	85.9
Strongly agree	11	14.1	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Schools are managed democratically (SHMDEM)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	21	26.9	26.9
Somewhat disagree	32	41.0	67.9
Neutral	10	12.8	80.8
Somewhat agree	13	16.7	97.4
Strongly agree	1	1.3	98.7
89	1	1.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

School leadership is elected locally without interference (SHLELW)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	40	51.3	51.3
Somewhat disagree	16	20.5	71.8
Neutral	12	15.4	87.2
Somewhat agree	8	10.3	97.4
Strongly agree	1	1.3	98.7
89	1	1.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Stakeholders are effectively involved in school governance (STISHG)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	24	30.8	30.8
Somewhat disagree	35	44.9	75.6
Neutral	12	15.4	91.0
Somewhat agree	4	5.1	96.2
89	3	3.8	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Financial management at the school level is transparent (FMSHLT)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	22	28.2	28.2
Somewhat disagree	29	37.2	65.4
Neutral	13	16.7	82.1
Somewhat agree	11	14.1	96.2
Strongly agree	1	1.3	97.4
89	2	2.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Schools can choose textbooks (SHCHTX)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	15	19.2	19.2
Somewhat disagree	16	20.5	39.7
Neutral	10	12.8	52.6
Somewhat agree	23	29.5	82.1
Strongly agree	12	15.4	97.4
89	2	2.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Schools are responsible for their own budget planning (SHROBG)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	22	28.2	28.2
Somewhat disagree	17	21.8	50.0
Neutral	13	16.7	66.7
Somewhat agree	16	20.5	87.2
Strongly agree	5	6.4	93.6
89	5	6.4	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Schools are entitled to hire and fire staff (SHEFHS)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly disagree	18	23.1	23.1
Somewhat disagree	12	15.4	38.5
Neutral	9	11.5	50.0
Somewhat agree	23	29.5	79.5
Strongly agree	14	17.9	97.4
89	2	2.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Q2. What activities does your organization currently undertake to improve the openness of education policy in your country?*	78
	100%
Carry out activities to support the openness of the education policy process (net)	27%
Carry out activities to support the openness of the education policy process	10%
Democratic management of schools	12%
Anti-corruption / transparency	10%
School autonomy	3%
Stakeholder involvement in educational policy making (net)	18%
Stakeholder involvement in educational policy making	18%
Awareness rising on various educational issues (net)	44%
Awareness rising on various educational issues	31%
Discuss / debate education policies	18%
Policy research and advocacy (net)	27%
Policy research and advocacy	10%
Research	8%
Contribute to policy-making	12%
Teacher Training Activities (Net)	37%
Teacher training activities	27%
Training activities in school management	9%
Develop methods to teach multiculturalism / human rights education	12%
Publishing Educational Materials (Net)	18%
Publishing educational materials	4%
Publications (nonspecific)	9%
Publish public policy papers	5%
Networking With Various Educational Stakeholders (Net)	26%
Networking with various educational stakeholders	14%
Cooperating with governmental organizations	10%
Cooperation with non-governmental organizations	9%
Community Involvement (Net)	18%
Parental involvement / support parental organizations	8%
Parent / community education	8%
Community involvement	5%
Curriculum Reform (Net)	19%
Curriculum reform / development	17%
Textbook review	3%
Gender sensitization / gender sensitization of textbooks	1%
Improve quality of education	1%
Equal Access (Net)	32%
Roma Education Initiative / Integration Programme	10%
Equal access	22%
Equal access for genders	1%
Equal access in rural areas	3%

Child Advocacy (Net)	10%
Child advocacy	5%
Child centered teaching and learning methodologies	5%
Focus on individual development	1%
School Performance Monitoring (Net)	6%
Self-development / self-assessment tools and standards for schools	4%
School performance monitoring	3%
Other (Net)	13%
Not involved in improving the openness of education policy	3%
Capacity development in education	3%
Strategic planning and management	6%
Improve school facilities, equipment, educational tools	1%
No response	3%

* **NOTE:** In the case of the open ended-questions the percentages indicate the share of respondents who mentioned the given answer among the top three issues/ activities/ etc.

Q3. What do you consider should be the most important education policy priorities in your country? (Please, list the three most important ones)	78
	100%
EQUAL ACCESS (NET)	58%
Equal access (nonspecific)	44%
Equal access for children with disabilities	12%
Equal access for genders	5%
Equal access for high-risk and low socioeconomic groups	4%
Equal access for minorities / multicultural education	6%
Equal access in rural areas	5%
SCHOOL AUTONOMY (NET)	14%
School autonomy	8%
Decentralization of the educational system	6%
OPENNESS OF THE POLICY PROCESS (NET)	33%
Openness of the policy process	14%
Democratic management of schools / education	19%
CURRICULUM REFORM (NET)	71%
Curriculum reform (nonspecific)	24%
School performance monitoring	19%
Teaching methods / innovations in teaching methods	4%
Tolerance / multicultural education	6%
Individualized teaching	4%
Quality of education	28%
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (NET)	19%
Community involvement (nonspecific)	9%
Stakeholder involvement in educational policy making	12%
Parent / community education	3%
TEACHER TRAINING (NET)	26%
Teacher training	15%
Professional development for teaching staff	12%
TRANSPARENCY (NET)	14%
Transparency and anti-corruption	10%
Transparency of budgetary process	4%
SCHOOL FUNDING POLICY (NET)	21%
School funding policies	13%
Improved textbooks / resources / infrastructure	8%
OTHER (NET)	21%
Against violence in families and schools	4%
Awareness rising on various educational issues	4%
Solve staffing problems in schools	1%
Monitor policy implementation	1%
Management of education system	3%
Focus on vocational schools	4%
Decrease influence of Catholic Church	1%
Increasing the policymaking capacity of the ministry	1%
No response	

Q4. What obstacles do you face in your work when dealing with general education policy issues? (Please list the top three challenges.)	78 100%
CENTRALIZATION OF EDUCATION GOVERNANCE (NET)	38%
Centralization of education governance	19%
Politicizing of the education system	13%
Bureaucracy	12%
Lack of openness of the policy process	5%
CORRUPTION AND PERSONAL INTERESTS (NET)	6%
Corruption and personal interests	6%
LACK OF POLICY COHERENCE (NET)	28%
Lack of policy coherence	24%
Implementation of policies	9%
RIGID DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES (NET)	19%
Rigid decision-making processes	4%
Limited influence / impact on decision-making process	15%
LIMITED TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY (NET)	12%
Limited transparency and accountability	12%
RESISTANCE OF CHANGE (NET)	32%
Resistance of change	21%
Lack of cooperation / support from government agencies	13%
LIMITED INFORMATION (NET)	33%
Limited information	12%
Lack of expertise / experience	19%
Lack of awareness	3%
LACK OF FUNDING / FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES	37%
Lack of funding / financial difficulties	23%
Lack of capacity in education system / to implement change	10%
Limited resources / equipment	5%
TEACHER TRAINING (NET)	9%
Lack of coherent system for professional development for teaching staff	8%
Financial support for professional development	3%
LACK OF INTEREST (NET)	17%
Lack of interest / motivation from stakeholders	14%
Lack of interest from government agencies	3%
LACK OF STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKING	15%
Lack of stakeholder involvement in educational policy making	15%
LACK OF CONSISTENT SCHOOL PERFORMANCE MONITORING (NET)	3%
Lack of consistent school performance monitoring	3%
LACK OF EQUAL ACCESS (NET)	6%
Lack of equal access	6%
OTHER (NET)	22%
Increasing population and increase in illiterate population	1%
Stereotypes / prejudice	4%
Staff fluctuation	3%

Poor quality of education	1%
Responsibilities unclear	5%
Perception of education as spending (vs. investment) area	1%
Fragmented system	4%
Organization not set up to deal with improving openness of education policy	1%
Lack of textbooks in native language	1%
Influence / opposition from religious institutions	3%
Low social status of teachers	1%
Poor communication of education policy	1%
No response	5%

Q5. In which areas should civil society organizations make the greatest contribution to educational change in your country?	78
	100%
CONTRIBUTE TO POLICY-MAKING (NET)	32%
Contribute to policy-making	26%
Research	12%
ACT AS WATCHDOG (NET)	8%
Act as a watchdog	4%
Anti-corruption	4%
RAISING AWARENESS ON EDUCATION ISSUES (NET)	27%
Raise awareness on education issues	22%
Public debates on education issues	5%
TRAINING ACTIVITIES (NET)	35%
Teacher training	28%
Community education / parental education	5%
Training activities in school management	5%
SUPPORT THE INVOLVEMENT OF DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS (NET)	28%
Support the involvement of different stakeholders	28%
TRANSPARENCY (NET)	13%
Contribute to policy transparency and accountability	13%
CARRY OUT ADVOCACY CAMPAIGNS ON VARIOUS EDUCATION ISSUES (NET)	51%
Carry out advocacy campaigns on various education issues	6%
Advocate multiculturalism / diversity in schools	13%
Advocate quality education	13%
EQUAL ACCESS (SUBNET)	37%
Equal access (nonspecific)	29%
Equal access for genders	3%
Equal access for children with disabilities	3%
Inclusion of minorities / Inclusion of Roma population	4 5%
Equal access in rural areas	4%
DEMOCRATIZATION OF EDUCATION SYSTEM (NET)	15%
Democratization of education system	14%
School autonomy	3%

CURRICULUM REFORM (NET)	42%
Curriculum reform	14%
Monitoring and assessing education	13%
Promote / implementation child-centered approach in education	4%
Innovative teaching methods	9%
Create and inform about best practices	8%
OTHER (NET)	31%
Population control	1%
Decentralization of education system	1%
Implement programs / policy reform	12%
Financing of schools / budget management	4%
Improve leadership / involvement in young people	3%
Provide mechanisms relevant to specific country / local area	1%
Improve infrastructure / provide new technologies	4%
Campaign against violence at school and in families	1%
Other activities do not have significant results because of lack of political influence	1%
Capacity building	3%
Cultural / religious	1%
Prevent drop-outs	1%
No response	1%

Q6. What do you think are the most important factors in relation to education that affect a child's chance in life? (Please list the top three factors.)	78
	100%
ACCESS TO QUALITY EDUCATION (NET)	32%
Access to quality education	14%
Equal access for genders	3%
Equal access for low socio-economic backgrounds	4%
Equal access in rural areas	4%
Equal access (nonspecific)	13%
INDIVIDUALIZED TEACHING (NET)	21%
Individualized teaching	9%
Focus on individual development	12%
FAMILY SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND (NET)	35%
Family socio-economic background	21%
Economic background / poverty	10%
Rural / urban environment	4%
Parent education	1%
Social / community conditions	17%
QUALITY OF TEACHING (NET)	64%
Quality of teaching	27%
Early childhood education	5%
Teachers / teacher's qualifications / professional development	17%
Teaching method / approach	13%
School environment	21%
Curriculum	9%
Quality of textbooks / resources	12%
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (NET)	15%
Community involvement	4%
Parental involvement	8%
School – community collaboration	8%
ATTITUDE / MOTIVATION (NET)	15%
Teacher's attitude / positive attitude	5%
ATTITUDE OF STUDENTS (SUBNET)	12%
Change attitude / attitude acquired	6%
Social responsibility	3%
Personal responsibility	3%
Motivation to learn	6%
SKILLS LEARNED (NET)	29%
Development of real life / practical skills	21%
Development of social skills / communication / team work	6%
Learn critical thinking / problem-solving skills	5%
Ability to use new technologies	4%
OTHER (NET)	32%
Other	1%
Language of instruction	1%
Literacy	1%

Vocational schools	1%
School performance monitoring	1%
Involvement of children in school governance	1%
Multiculturalism / diversity in schools	8%
Political factors	3%
Experts' opinion	1%
Influence of globalization and consumer society	1%
Corruption	4%
Freedom of choice / offer alternatives	5%
Opportunity for adult education	3%
Non-governmental organizations	
Government agencies / ministries	1%
Implementation of reforms	1%
No response	3%

Q7. *How urgently should the following social inclusion issues be addressed in your country?*

The enhancement of access to general education) ENAGED)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not urgent at all	3	3.8	3.8
Not that urgent	9	11.5	15.4
Neutral	12	15.4	30.8
Somewhat urgent	20	25.6	56.4
Very Urgent	34	43.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

The increase of enrolment rates of vulnerable groups (IERVGR)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not urgent at all	1	1.3	1.3
Not that urgent	2	2.6	3.8
Neutral	8	10.3	14.1
Somewhat urgent	26	33.3	47.4
Very Urgent	40	51.3	98.7
89.00	1	1.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Support diversity in school (SUDVSH)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not urgent at all	1	1.3	1.3
Not that urgent	1	1.3	2.6
Neutral	9	11.5	14.1
Somewhat urgent	30	38.5	52.6
Very Urgent	37	47.4	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

Improvement of quality services for children with special needs in schools ISCHSN

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not that urgent	1	1.3	1.3
Neutral	5	6.4	7.7
Somewhat urgent	16	20.5	28.2
Very Urgent	54	69.2	97.4
89.00	2	2.6	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

OTHERN

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Neutral	1	1.3	2.9
Somewhat urgent	4	5.1	14.7
Very Urgent	27	34.6	94.1
89	2	2.6	100.0
Total	34	43.6	

Q8. *Does your organization currently undertake any activities to improve equal access to quality general education in your country?*

AIEQAE

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Yes	65	83,3	83,3
No	12	15,4	98,7
89	1	1,3	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Q9. To what extent are the following groups involved in the decision-making process at the school level?

Parent associations PARASO

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not at all	8	10,3	10,3
To a little extent	35	44,9	55,1
Neutral	10	12,8	67,9
To some extent	22	28,2	96,2
89	3	3,8	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Student associations STUASO

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not at all	17	21,8	21,8
To a little extent	36	46,2	67,9
Neutral	9	11,5	79,5
To some extent	13	16,7	96,2
89,00	3	3,8	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Local civil society organizations (LOCCSO)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not at all	15	19,2	19,2
To a little extent	36	46,2	65,4
Neutral	10	12,8	78,2
To some extent	11	14,1	92,3
89,00	6	7,7	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Religious bodies (RELBOB)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not at all	30	38,5	38,5
To a little extent	20	25,6	64,1
Neutral	9	11,5	75,6
To some extent	10	12,8	88,5
89,00	9	11,5	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Local government (LOGGOV)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not at all	5	6,4	6,4
To a little extent	9	11,5	17,9
Neutral	13	16,7	34,6
To some extent	28	35,9	70,5
89,00	23	29,5	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

OTHERN1

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Not at all	2	2,6	15,4
To a little extent	1	1,3	23,1
Neutral	2	2,6	38,5
To some extent	3	3,8	61,5
To a large extent	5	6,4	100,0
Total	13	16,7	
System	65	83,3	
	78	100,0	

Q10. What are the school governance issues (if any) that you focus on? (Please list the three most important ones.)	78 100%
DEMOCRATIC MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS (NET)	19%
School autonomy	4%
Democratic management of schools	14%
Change school management	3%
SUPPORT THE INVOLVEMENT OF DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS (NET)	49%
Community involvement in school management	15%
Parental involvement in school management	28%
Support the involvement of different stakeholders	13%
Teacher involvement in school management	3%
Student involvement / developing student governance	13%
Support involvement of non-governmental organizations	3%
School level management capacity development	6%
Transparency of budgetary processes	14%
School funding policies	6%
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE MONITORING (NET)	17%
School performance monitoring	8%
Self-development / self-assessment tools and standards for schools	8%
Support incentive system for teachers based on quality of teaching	4%
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHING STAFF (NET)	31%
Professional development for teachers	13%
Professional development for school management	15%
Equal access / support multiculturalism / diversity in schools	6%
Teaching methodology for children of different capabilities	3%
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING (NET)	35%
School improvement / development planning	19%
Quality of education	5%
Improve technology for education process	4%
Contribute to school management	8%
Curriculum reform	3%
OTHER (NET)	17%
Decentralization of decision making	3%
Coherent education policies	5%
Cooperating with governmental organizations	3%
Accessibility - physical and information	1%
Support teachers' rights	1%
Network of schools / school governing bodies	1%
Community development / manage social risks	3%
No response	18%

Q11. Over the last three years, do you think that the funding opportunities for civil society organizations working on general education issues have increased or decreased?

Domestic corporate/business (DOMBUS)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	3	3,8	3,8
Somewhat increased	27	34,6	38,5
Somewhat decreased	7	9,0	47,4
Significantly decreased	5	6,4	53,8
89	36	46,2	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

International corporate/business (INTBUS)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	4	5,1	5,1
Somewhat increased	18	23,1	28,2
Somewhat decreased	16	20,5	48,7
Significantly decreased	5	6,4	55,1
89	35	44,9	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Funding from local government (FLCGOV)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	2	2,6	2,6
Somewhat increased	33	42,3	44,9
Somewhat decreased	12	15,4	60,3
Significantly decreased	5	6,4	66,7
89	26	33,3	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Funding from national government (FNTGOV)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	3	3,8	3,8
Somewhat increased	31	39,7	43,6
Somewhat decreased	18	23,1	66,7
Significantly decreased	6	7,7	74,4
89	20	25,6	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Funding through bilateral agreements (FBLAGR)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	3	3,8	3,8
Somewhat increased	22	28,2	32,1
Somewhat decreased	11	14,1	46,2
Significantly decreased	4	5,1	51,3
89	38	48,7	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Local trusts/ foundations (LOCFOU)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	2	2,6	2,6
Somewhat increased	17	21,8	24,4
Somewhat decreased	19	24,4	48,7
Significantly decreased	11	14,1	62,8
89	29	37,2	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

International trusts/ foundation (INTFOU)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	4	5,1	5,1
Somewhat increased	23	29,5	34,6
Somewhat decreased	25	32,1	66,7
Significantly decreased	14	17,9	84,6
89	12	15,4	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Individual donors (INDDON)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly increased	2	2,6	2,6
Somewhat increased	21	26,9	29,5
Somewhat decreased	5	6,4	35,9
Significantly decreased	7	9,0	44,9
89	43	55,1	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Q12. *Currently, in which of the following areas do you think it is easy or difficult to raise funds for your organization's activities related to school reform?*

Promoting inclusive policy-making (PROIPM)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly easier	3	3,8	3,8
Somewhat easier	32	41,0	44,9
Somewhat difficult	19	24,4	69,2
Significantly difficult	17	21,8	91,0
89	7	9,0	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Ensuring social inclusion in schools (ENSISH)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly easier	6	7,7	7,7
Somewhat easier	37	47,4	55,1
Somewhat difficult	18	23,1	78,2
Significantly difficult	12	15,4	93,6
89	5	6,4	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Carrying out activities supporting quality education (CASQED)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly easier	8	10,3	10,3
Somewhat easier	31	39,7	50,0
Somewhat difficult	25	32,1	82,1
Significantly difficult	11	14,1	96,2
89	3	3,8	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Facilitating open and democratic governance (FASQED)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly easier	2	2,6	2,6
Somewhat easier	31	39,7	42,3
Somewhat difficult	19	24,4	66,7
Significantly difficult	17	21,8	88,5
89	9	11,5	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Promoting access to general education (PACGED)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly easier	8	10,3	10,3
Somewhat easier	39	50,0	60,3
Somewhat difficult	14	17,9	78,2
Significantly difficult	5	6,4	84,6
89	12	15,4	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Undertaking activities focused on reducing corruption in the education system (AFRCED)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Significantly easier	10	12,8	12,8
Somewhat easier	20	25,6	38,5
Somewhat difficult	11	14,1	52,6
Significantly difficult	19	24,4	76,9
89	18	23,1	100,0
Total	78	100,0	

Q13. What priority areas, in regards to general education in your country, do you consider to be under funded by donors? (Please list the three most important ones.)	78
	100%
EDUCATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT (NET)	12%
Education quality assessment	12%
TEACHER TRAINING (NET)	44%
Teacher training	36%
Innovative / alternative teaching methods	9%
Training activities in school management	5%
Individualized teaching	4%
ACTIVITIES STRENGTHENING SCHOOL MANAGEMENT CAPACITIES (NET)	24%
Activities strengthening school management capacities	10%
Democratic management of schools / education	10%
Decentralization of the educational system	6%
ACTIVITIES TO FURTHER EDUCATION REFORM (NET)	28%
Activities to further educational reform	18%
Increased quality of education	15%
PROMOTION OF INCLUSIVE POLICY-MAKING (NET)	35%
Promotion of inclusive policy-making	23%
Adult / community education	3%
Equal access for females / gender sensitization	4%
Education / support for children with disabilities / special needs	6%
Transportation for students in rural areas	1%

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (NET)	27%
Curriculum development	13%
Pre-school and primary school education	5%
Development of real life / practical skills	3%
Multicultural education	8%
ADVOCACY CAMPAIGNS ON VARIOUS ISSUES (NET)	56%
Advocacy campaigns on various issues	6%
TRANSPARENCY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION (NET)	8%
Transparency and anti-corruption	8%
RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION (NET)	33%
School infrastructure	13%
Textbooks / development of new textbooks	10%
School equipment / resources	9%
IT technologies / development of assistive technologies	8%
SURVEY AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES (NET)	10%
Survey and research activities	10%
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT (NET)	15%
Stakeholder involvement in school management	9%
Parental involvement	5%
Student involvement / developing student governance	5%
OTHER (NET)	21%
Support incentive system for teachers based on quality of teaching	1%
Publications	4%
Awareness rising on various educational issues	4%
Teacher mentoring	1%
Scholarships for gifted students / study abroad	1%
Teacher's salaries	1%
School funding / funding policy	4%
There are no donors in Lithuania because of the EU structural funds.	1%
Services development	1%
Build professional capacity	3%
No response	1%

Q14. *What is the average grant size for the various individual projects currently carried out by your organization?*

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-15000	13	16.7	20.6
15001-30000	16	20.5	46.0
30001-45000	4	5.1	52.4
45001-60000	8	10.3	65.1
60001-75000	4	5.1	71.4
75001-90000	4	5.1	77.8
OVER 90001	14	17.9	100.0
Missing	15	19.2	
Total	78	100.0	

Q15. What type of organization do you work for?

	Frequency
Think tank	12
Policy center	4
NGO	52
Foundations	18
Public Institution	5
Professional organization	5
Total	96

Note: Some respondents selected multiple answers.

Q16. Which year was your organization set up?

Year	Frequency	Year	Frequency	Year	Frequency
1988	1	1996	1	2002	6
1991	1	1997	5	2003	5
1992	4	1998	4	2004	4
1993	3	1999	10	2005	1
1994	5	2000	12	2006	2
1995	3	2001	7	Total	75

Q17. What is the number of employees at your organization?

Full-time

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-3	16	20.5	23.9
4-5	13	16.7	43.3
6-9	20	25.6	73.1
Over 9	18	23.1	100.0
Missing	11	14.1	
Total	78	100.0	

Part-time

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-3	35	44.9	67.3
4-5	8	10.3	82.7
6-9	1	1.3	84.6
Over 9	8	66.7	100.0
Missing	26	33.3	
Total	78	100.0	

Contract basis

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-3	11	14.1	19.6
4-5	7	9.0	32.1
6-9	9	11.5	48.2
Over 9	29	37.2	100.0
Missing	22	28.2	
Total	78	100.0	

Volunteers

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-3	11	14.1	25.0
4-5	6	7.7	38.6
6-9	4	5.1	47.7
10-14	5	6.4	59.1
15-19	4	5.1	68.2
Over 19	14	17.9	100.0
Missing	34	43.6	
Total	78	100.0	

Q18. *What was your organization's annual budget for the following fiscal years?*

Year2003

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-49,999	16	20.5	24.6
50,000-99,999	5	6.4	32.3
100,000-199,999	14	17.9	53.8
200,000-299,999	3	3.8	58.5
Over 300,000	27	34.6	100.0
Missing	13	16.7	
Total	78	100.0	

Year2004

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-49,999	12	15.4	17.6
50,000-99,999	9	11.5	30.9
100,000-199,999	13	16.7	50.0
200,000-299,999	9	11.5	63.2
Over 300,000	25	32.1	100.0
Missing	10	12.8	
Total	78	100.0	

Year2005

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
0-49,999	13	16.7	18.6
50,000-99,999	9	11.5	31.4
100,000-199,999	12	15.4	48.6
200,000-299,999	10	12.8	62.9
Over 300,000	26	33.3	100.0
Missing	8	10.3	
Total	78	100.0	

Q19. In what country is your organization based?	78
Albania	3
Armenia	2
Azerbaijan	4
BiH	2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2
Bulgaria	3
Croatia	1
Czech Republic	1
Georgia	4
Hungary	2
Kosovo	4
Kazakhstan	1
Kyrgyzstan	3
Latvia	1
Lithuania	3
Republic of Macedonia	3
Republic of Moldova	4
Mongolia	1
Montenegro	2
Pakistan	5
Poland	2
Romania	6
Russia	2
Serbia	4
Slovakia	4
Slovenia	2
Ukraine	3
Turkey	3
No response	1

Q20. <i>What do you consider to be the top three essential capacity areas your organization needs support for in order to be involved in general education reform? (Please, list the three most important ones)</i>	78 100%
ADVOCACY SKILLS DEVELOPMENT (NET)	27%
Advocacy skills development	19%
Support advocacy	12%
POLICY-MAKING (NET)	28%
Policy writing skills	13%
Policy analysis	6%
Policy implementation	3%
Contribute to policy-making	9%
PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT (NET)	46%
Professional capacity development	38%
Leadership training	3%
Volunteer management / volunteer training	4%
Increase professional capacity	3%
FUNDRAISING SKILLS DEVELOPMENT (NET)	32%
Fundraising skills development	8%
Financial support / assist with fundraising	24%
Educational materials / resources	4%
NETWORKING (NET)	24%
Networking	10%
Regional / international networking	9%
Partnerships with other civil organizations	5%
Cooperation with government agencies	4%
MONITORING AND EVALUATING (NET)	21%
Monitoring and evaluation	15%
Support the openness of the education policy process	3%
Transparency and anti-corruption	5%
RESEARCH (NET)	13%
Develop research skills	10%
Support research	3%
COMMUNICATION (NET)	10%
Communication / publications	10%
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (NET)	6%
Curriculum development	6%
PROJECT PLANNING	8%
Project planning / management	8%
EXPERTISE IN SPECIFIC AREAS	10%
Expertise in democratic school governance	3%
Exchange of information	8%
SUPPORT THE INVOLVEMENT OF DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS	4%
Community involvement	4%
Parental involvement	3%

OTHER	13%
Other	4%
Self-sustainability	1%
General education reform	1%
We don't see how somebody could help us to be more influential.	1%
As said, we obviously are not the organization this questionnaire has been designed for. Our concern is extra curricular / leisure time activities and perhaps introducing new methods of education - we are not involved in general education reform	1%
Support for small initiatives of teachers and parents	1%
General problem is funding for existing (staff costs) and it is still impossible to be directly involved in general education reform because of politics	1%
Donors do not want to cover administrative costs	3%
Improve ICT capacity for on-line communication	1%
No response	5%